

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 1:24-CR-31 (LAG)
	:	
DUN TERRIUS BRADFORD,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant Dun Terrius Bradford’s Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial (Motion). (Doc. 30). Therein, Defendant moves to continue trial in this matter, which is currently scheduled for April 21, 2025, to a date to be determined by the Court. (*Id.* at 1; Doc. 24).

On August 14, 2024, Defendant Dun Terrius Bradford was charged with sixty-seven counts of possessing a dog for use in an animal fighting venture, one count of manufacture of and possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance, and one count of possession of a firearm in furtherance of the manufacture of and possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance, and dog fighting offenses. (Doc. 1). Defendant was arrested on September 5, 2024 and subsequently released on bond on the same day. (Docs. 8, 14–15). On October 21, 2024, the Court scheduled Defendant’s pretrial conference and trial for October 24, 2024 and October 28, 2024, respectively. (Doc. 21). The Court granted Defendant’s first Motion to Continue on October 23, 2024. (Docs. 22, 23). On December 20, 2024, the Court scheduled Defendant’s pretrial conference and trial for April 4, 2025 and April 21, 2025, respectively. (Doc. 24). On March 4, 2025, the Court reset the pretrial conference for March 27, 2025. (*See* Docket). On March 17, 2025, Defendant filed the instant Motion. (Doc. 30). Therein, Defendant’s Counsel represents that in addition to the “voluminous” discovery the Government has already provided, the Government has also agreed to provide the Defendant with “contents of the video

surveillance footage” recently seized by law enforcement. (*Id.* ¶¶ 12, 13). Defendant’s Counsel further represents that “[u]pon receipt of this video surveillance, Defendant would need additional time to review the contents of same for any items of evidentiary value contained therein.” (*Id.* ¶ 13). The Government does not oppose Defendant’s Motion. (*Id.* ¶ 17).

Upon due consideration, the Court finds that the “ends of justice served by the granting of [a] continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Specifically, the Court finds that failing to grant a continuance would result in a miscarriage of justice and deny Defendant’s Counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (iv). Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion (Doc. 30) is **GRANTED**, and the delay occasioned by this continuance shall be deemed **EXCLUDABLE** pursuant to the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the pretrial conference and trial in the above-captioned matter shall be **CONTINUED** to a date to be determined later. The deadlines in the Court’s December 20, 2024 Scheduling Order (Doc. 24) are hereby terminated, and a new scheduling order will be forthcoming.

**SO ORDERED**, this 18th day of March, 2025.

/s/ Leslie A. Gardner  
**LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**